Craig Wallace Dye

Revised Comprehensive Clinical Profile and Assessment of Emotional Investment in Gary Freedman

A Deep Research Analysis Incorporating Both Documentary Records

A Deep Research Analysis Incorporating Both Documentary Records

Prefatory Note on Methodology and Epistemological Limits

This analysis is derived from two documentary records compiled by Gary Freedman: (1) the merged CWD file comprising blog posts, letters to psychiatrists, psychoanalytic annotations, and transcripts of direct interactions with Craig Wallace Dye; and (2) the autobiographical narrative "A Meeting of Joyce and Proust: Water World II — Martin's Unslakable Thirst," which provides first-person scene-by-scene accounts of their encounters from the perspective of lived experience. The psychoanalytic theoretical frameworks invoked include Wilhelm Reich's *Character Analysis*, Alexander Lowen's *Narcissism: Denial of the True Self*, J.D.W. Andrews's work on hysterical personality, the object-relations frameworks of Kohut and Blos, and J.O. Wisdom's methodological approach to hysteria. The analysis is inferential and psychodynamic in nature, not a formal clinical diagnosis. All biographical data about Craig Wallace Dye (hereafter CWD) is drawn from what he reported to Freedman and may contain inaccuracies. The analysis operates on the psychological coherence and behavioral pattern of the interactions as documented, not on the literal veracity of all biographical claims.

The second document adds a decisive corrective to the picture established by the first: the relational dynamic was not Craig's creation alone. It was co-constructed from the very first day, with Freedman bringing his own competitive anxiety, ambivalence, and emotional hunger to the encounter. This bilateral dimension is fully integrated into the revised analysis below.

Part I: Clinical Personality Profile of Craig Wallace Dye

I.1 Biographical and Developmental Substrate

Craig Wallace Dye was born April 9, 1959, and began employment at the law firm of Hogan & Hartson on October 6, 1986, at age 27, having been referred by Esperanza "Espe" Rebollar, the department's database administrator, with whom he had worked previously. He came from a broken and reconstituted family in a rural area outside Buffalo, New York. Both parents had been previously married and had children from those prior unions; one half-brother is reported to have been of mixed racial heritage (his mother's first husband said to have been a Native American, though this claim has been disputed in the record by an anonymous commenter).

CWD's mother was a schoolteacher who was explicitly strict: *"my mother was very hard on me"* — a disclosure Freedman rightly identifies as formative. His father worked in a steel mill, representing a blue-collar, physically masculine, achievement-poor milieu. CWD did not initially expect to attend college, planning instead to follow his father to the mill, yet eventually enrolled at SUNY-Buffalo. In psychoanalytic terms, this trajectory suggests an identification conflict between the father's working-class masculinity and the mother's intellectually demanding standards — a conflict that would shadow CWD's relationship to achievement for the rest of his documented history.

His academic record at SUNY-Buffalo was reportedly unimpressive, but he excelled in graduate school, earning a Master's degree in international relations from Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies. CWD scored in the 99th percentile on the Law School Admission Test yet, after being accepted to several elite law schools — including Harvard, the University of Pennsylvania, and Georgetown — he declined to attend, thereby "foreclosing an important career opportunity." This self-sabotage of extraordinary potential is among the most psychoanalytically significant facts in the record. He was, by multiple accounts, handsome, physically fit, intelligent, and charismatic — a man whose appearance and bearing conformed closely to Wilhelm Reich's physical description of the phallic-narcissistic character type: "athletic," "hard and sharp masculine lines," energetic, and sometimes displaying what Reich called a "baby face" femininity coexisting with the athletic habitus.

I.2 The First Encounter: The Mutually Co-Constructed Beginning

The second documentary record supplies what the CWD file alone could not: a vivid, first-person account of the very moment Freedman and CWD met on the morning of October 6, 1986. It reveals that Freedman had formed a strong dislike of CWD *before* he arrived. A

coworker had warned him: *"They're hiring a new guy. He's really good. They might just decide they don't need you anymore."* Freedman's first thought upon introduction: *"So you're the guy who's going to take my job."*

This bilateral opening is clinically decisive. Freedman's initial contempt — calling Craig a "dime-store scholar," privately comparing him to Sartre's Self-Taught Man — was a *defense* against the competitive threat he represented. Craig, knowing nothing of this, arrived with his characteristic self-contained posture ("the Pope"), and the two men spent the remainder of the week in what Freedman calls "uneasy confinement, like actors in a mimed two-man existentialist play." Neither spoke to the other. Craig's silence was his habitual mode; Freedman's silence was something more complex — a mixture of competitive guardedness and schizoid withdrawal. When Craig then reacted to that week's mutual silence with sarcasm ("It was really nice spending the week with you, Gary"), he was responding to what he experienced as Freedman's aggression — not knowing that Freedman had his own reasons for the silence.

This is the foundational insight the second document provides: the double-bind that defined their relationship was not Craig's alone to initiate. It was co-constructed from the first day. Both men brought powerful, pre-formed psychological investments to a relationship that had not yet begun.

I.3 Core Personality Structure: The Phallic-Narcissistic Character

The core issue of CWD's personality is his **phallic-narcissistic character**, which in him was strikingly defined. Wilhelm Reich introduced this character type in 1926 to describe a constellation standing between compulsion neurosis and hysteria. The typical phallic-narcissistic character is "self-confident, often arrogant, elastic, energetic, often impressive in his bearing." His narcissism is expressed not in an infantile, cringing manner but in "a blatantly self-confident way, with a flagrant display of superiority and dignity." Nonetheless, "the basis of their nature is no less infantile than that of other types" — it is compensatory, reactive, and defensive rather than genuinely earned.

CWD's self-presentation throughout the documented interactions conforms perfectly to this profile. He was imperious, condescending, and extravagant in his claims of social selectivity: *"I generally don't make an effort to be friendly with people. I wait for people to come to me. And they generally do. Kind of like the Pope."* He demanded audiences rather than making social efforts — insisting that others come to him. This is not mere introversion but a grandiose interpersonal posture in which the world orbits his sun.

Core Phallic-Narcissistic Traits Documented in CWD

1. Grandiosity and Social Imperialism

CWD explicitly positioned himself as a gatekeeper of friendship, articulating the criterion that only "special" people could be his friends: *"I don't know if you're special enough to be my friend. A person has to be special to be one of my friends."* He demanded audiences rather than making social efforts. This is not mere introversion but a grandiose interpersonal posture: the world orbits his sun, and entry into his social sphere requires a performance of worthiness.

2. Phallic Exhibitionism, Risk-Taking, and Sexual Opportunism

CWD's sexual history is saturated with phallic exhibitionism. He prided himself on having had sex with two different women within a 24-hour period during his college years — an achievement he recounted with pride. He reportedly engaged in a sexual relationship with Espe Rebollar, his departmental supervisor. He simultaneously pursued Alexandra Zapruder, a 19-year-old college intern from a wealthy and prominent family (the Zapruder Film family), when he was 29.

The second document enriches this dimension with two specific details. First, Craig revealed that he had once considered enlisting in the Air Force after college and that his grandfather had been a German fighter pilot — an ancestral identification with masculine daring, aerial combat, and risk that speaks directly to Reich's characterization of the phallic-narcissistic type as drawn to "aggressive courage." Second, the Christmas 1988 scene now includes Craig showing Freedman his motorcycle — the quintessential phallic-narcissistic prop, a machine of speed, risk, and exhibitionistic masculinity. His love for films about dictators and conquerors (the Abel Gance *Napoleon*, Eisenstein's *Ivan the Terrible*, both featuring the Prokofiev score he played at home) completes this cultural profile of phallic identification with power and domination.

3. Underemployment and the Chronic Narcissistic Injury

CWD's chronic underemployment — a man with an elite graduate degree working as a technical support employee in a law firm — represents the most structurally significant source of narcissistic injury in his character economy. As Freedman correctly observes, "his underemployment at Hogan, which was a continual threat to self-esteem, disposed him to a persistent tendency to arrogance." The arrogance is not merely character; it is a *reaction formation* against the humiliation of occupying a position far below his abilities.

This dynamic also explains, in part, his failure to attend law school despite acceptance to elite institutions. Freedman, following Peter Blos, proposes that CWD's inhibition against actualizing his intellectual potential reflects an unconscious equation of achievement with submission — specifically, with a passive, feminine subordination to a dominant parent. Blos: *"A son's subordination of his life's work, ambition, dedication, and achievement to the libidinized*

expectations of his father are experienced by the son as a submissive and passive adaptation." To succeed intellectually — to fulfill his mother's intellectual imperatives — would be to place himself in a feminized role. The phallic-narcissistic solution is to ward off such passivity through exhibitionistic aggression and to sabotage achievement rather than risk the ego-dystonic experience of submission.

4. Aggression as the Syntax of Desire

Reich observed that the phallic-narcissistic character "will usually anticipate any impending attack with an attack of his own." The second document provides one of the earliest and purest instances of this dynamic: Craig's party invitation of September 1987, delivered in the words *"If you don't come to my party, I will burn down your house and kidnap your dog."* This violent hyperbole is entirely disproportionate to a casual social invitation, and it reveals Craig's characteristic mode of expressing desire through aggression. He cannot simply say "I'd like you to come." The invitation has to be wrapped in mock menace. This is the same structure as the birthday-visit sadism, the no-show at Café Mozart followed by the Christmas invitation, the harangue at the Christmas party. Desire + aggression = the Craig Dye interpersonal signature, traceable to the earliest months of their acquaintance.

5. The Birthday Visit as Emblematic Incident (December 23, 1987)

On Freedman's 34th birthday, Craig made the extraordinary gesture of dressing up, wearing a jacket and tie — unusually formal — and visiting Freedman's office for a friendly chat, which he rarely if ever initiated. After a few pleasant minutes, as he rose to leave, he delivered the cruelty: *"I just wanted to make your day"* — explicitly referencing Freedman's earlier remark to a female coworker about a gift she had given him. The warmth was bait; the cruelty was the hook. Craig had overheard the remark to Mara Jane Linen hours earlier and engineered the entire encounter to deploy it. He needed to discharge any libidinal investment before it could become visible to himself or others as vulnerability. The sadism functions as a *disavowal mechanism*: by contaminating the warmth with cruelty, Craig can interact with Freedman while simultaneously denying the genuine affective valence of that interaction.

6. The "Different Lifestyle" Defense and Identity Policing

Craig's repeated invocation of the "different lifestyle" rationale for social distance functions as an identity-protective device. The lifestyle claim is not an explanation but a mystification — it reframes a psychological conflict about intimacy, submission, and homosexual anxiety into a neutral sociological difference. It allows Craig to maintain superiority while deflecting from the real stakes of the interaction. Critically, the second document reveals that this "different lifestyles" speech came approximately six weeks *after* Craig's passionate declaration, in May 1987, that they had "so much to talk about." The reversal in six weeks — from enthusiastic enumeration of shared interests to a claim of unbridgeable lifestyle difference — confirms either

deep ambivalence, psychic instability, or deliberate performance. Most likely all three.

I.4 The Hysterical Shadow: Regression Under Relational Stress

The most clinically sophisticated and counterintuitive element of Freedman's analysis is his recognition that CWD — despite his predominantly phallic-narcissistic character — responded to Freedman specifically with a **hysterical** relational posture. This is not a contradiction; it is evidence of a deeper layer of personality organization. Lowen notes that the female counterpart to the phallic-narcissistic male is the hysterical character type. What Freedman observed in CWD's interactions with him was precisely this hysterical shadow: the use of double-bind communications, the dangling of symbolic sexuality, the oscillation between depicting Freedman as either rapist or cold rejecter.

J.O. Wisdom's formulation is particularly apt: *"The hysteric dangles before another person symbolic sexuality which can be readily taken as a real invitation or the beginning of a seduction... the victim who declines is regarded as rejecting or mean... while the victim who goes forward to meet the advances is regarded as guilty of rape — whatever is done is wrong."* This describes Craig's double-bind in relation to Freedman with uncanny precision: Freedman could neither ignore Craig (which Craig experienced as aggression) nor approach him (which Craig sexualized into a homoerotic threat).

Freedman's explanation for this regression is persuasive: it was a **transference response**, in which Craig unconsciously reenacted a struggle with an adult figure from his past — almost certainly his strict, intellectually demanding mother — whose expectations carried the risk of placing Craig in an ego-dystonic feminized role. To satisfy that figure's expectations meant to submit; to refuse meant punishment. Freedman, as a figure of intellectual parity or superiority, triggered this archaic conflict and became its current object.

I.5 The Gift as Coded Message: *Gold and Iron* (May 13, 1988)

The second document provides a culturally rich detail absent from the first: for Craig's belated birthday gift at lunch on May 13, 1988, Freedman gave him *Gold and Iron* by Columbia University historian Fritz Stern — a study of the personal and professional relationship between Otto von Bismarck and his Jewish banker, Gerson Bleichröder, who "ambitiously penetrated the highest levels of German government, defying the obdurate antisemitism of the day." The parallel to their own relationship is striking and almost certainly unconscious: a powerful Gentile gatekeeper and a gifted Jewish intellectual of exceptional capabilities, in an asymmetrical but charged, enduring bond. Daniel Cutler simultaneously mentioned Hermann Hesse's *Demian* — a novel about a young man torn between carnality and strict parental moralism who ultimately

revolts against bourgeois ideals — and Craig recognized that his mother's maiden name was Hess, visibly registering the resonance. This literary moment encodes the relational dynamic they were living, in miniature.

I.6 The Christmas 1988 Scene: Phallic Exhibitionism in Full Register

The second document provides the richest extant account of the Christmas 1988 visit — identified in the clinical report as one of the most emotionally significant encounters. New details transform this scene from a data point into a near-novelistic vignette. Craig walked his English sheepdog, remarking casually that "the bitch is in heat — she whines when she's in heat" (a characteristically phallic observation delivered without apparent irony). He then showed Freedman his motorcycle — the paradigmatic prop of masculine risk and exhibitionism in the phallic-narcissistic's object world. He retrieved a pomegranate from the refrigerator — a fruit freighted with mythological resonance (Persephone, the underworld, the seduction that traps) — offered it to Freedman (who declined), and then changed into a red flannel shirt to avoid the juice, promptly *dousing himself with Grey Flannel cologne*. The flannel shirt as gesture of rugged masculine authenticity; the cologne as vanity; the combination as the essential Craig Dye paradox — genuine masculine impulse dressed in performance. This is the phallic-narcissistic character rendered in domestic detail.

I.7 Dominant Defense Mechanisms

Defense Mechanism	Manifestation in CWD's Behavior
Projection	Attributing to Freedman the sexual fantasies and aggressive impulses originating in Craig's own unconscious; depicting Freedman as homosexually desirous or a "potential rapist"
Reaction Formation	Warmth converted into cruelty (birthday visit); inclusion converted into humiliation; the Christmas standing-up followed by the Christmas Day invitation
Splitting	Freedman oscillates in Craig's psychic world between idealized potential companion ("we have so much to talk about!") and degraded reject ("he probably spends all his time staring at his nice apartment")
Disavowal	Systematic denial of emotional investment through claims of indifference, the "different lifestyle" speech, and refusal to commit to social plans

Defense Mechanism	Manifestation in CWD's Behavior
Preemptive Sadism	The payment of humiliation as the entry fee to social contact; sadistic acts structurally linked to warm gestures (mattress prank, birthday visit, the no-show at Café Mozart preceding the Christmas invitation, the violent party invitation)
Aggression as desire's syntax	Desire expressed exclusively through aggressive or mocking forms rather than direct warmth (the party invitation; the birthday cruelty; the final phone call's cruel valediction)
Intellectualization	Retreating into bureaucratic and professional frameworks in emotionally charged moments (the final phone call)

I.8 The Abandonment Complex and the Displaced Terminator

One of the richest clinical observations in the record is Freedman's analysis of the final phone call (July 14, 1993) through the lens of abandonment dynamics. Craig's opening — *"Why are you calling me after all this time?"* — has a double meaning: surface annoyance at being called, and latent anger at being abandoned. Throughout their post-employment friendship, Craig's girlfriend was intermittently absent (in Paris for a year, then in San Francisco). At precisely these times, Craig's interactions with Freedman became more intense, more paternally invested, and more emotionally revealing. At the luncheon of November 14, 1989, when the girlfriend was in Paris, Craig advised Freedman — in a strikingly paternal register — *"You need to make an attempt to be friendly with people."*

The hypothesis emerges that Craig's termination of the friendship was, in part, a displacement of the termination anxiety associated with his romantic relationship — he became the abandoner in relation to Freedman as a means of mastering his anxiety about being abandoned by his girlfriend. This is structurally consonant with the phallic-narcissistic character's characteristic use of active mastery to ward off passive suffering: rather than experience the vulnerability of being left, Craig enacted the leaving.

I.9 The Paradox of Squandered Potential: "The Exceptions"

Freedman cites J. Fernando's paper on "The Exceptions" (*The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, 1997) in connection with Craig. The "exceptions" are individuals who, following a specific early injury or injustice, develop an unconscious entitlement to exemption from ordinary rules of effort, reciprocity, and limitation: *because I suffered this early wrong, I am owed special treatment; the ordinary constraints of life do not apply to me.* Craig's pattern — exceptional intelligence and credentials, refusal to pursue the career those credentials warranted,

grandiose entitlement to others' solicitation, contempt for ordinary social reciprocity — fits this formulation closely. The law school refusal is perhaps the purest expression: to have been accepted to Harvard Law and to decline is not modesty; it is a form of sovereign exemption from the ordinary logic of human aspiration.

I.10 Summary Psychodynamic Formulation

Craig Wallace Dye presents as a man of exceptional intellectual endowment whose psychological development was organized around the management of a specific constellation of conflicts: a strict, intellectually demanding mother who instilled both ambition and the terror of feminine submission; a working-class father who modeled masculine toughness but limited aspiration; a family structure marked by rupture and reconstitution; and an abiding narcissistic wound around his chronic underemployment relative to his abilities.

His **phallic-narcissistic character** represents the character-level solution to these conflicts: the performance of aggressive masculine superiority as a defense against the feared passive, feminine, submissive position. His considerable sexual exhibitionism, his self-sabotage of intellectual achievement, his grandiose social imperialism, his identification with conquerors and risk-takers (German fighter pilots, Napoleon, Ivan the Terrible, motorcycle riding), and his preemptive interpersonal sadism are all expressions of this core defensive operation.

Under relational stress — particularly in the presence of Freedman, who activated his deepest transference conflicts — his defenses regressed into a **hysterical** posture characterized by double-bind communications, symbolic eroticism, and the creation of impossible interpersonal scenarios. This regression was not random: it was activated specifically by Freedman's particular psychological signature, and it was co-produced by the bilateral structure of their encounter from its very inception.

Part II: The Nature and Intensity of Craig Dye's Emotional Investment in Gary Freedman

II.1 The Revised Bilateral Frame

The first report established that Craig's emotional investment in Freedman was intense, psychodynamically saturated, and structurally enduring, but expressed primarily through distortion and devaluation rather than conscious affection. The second document requires one major revision to that finding: the relationship was not simply Craig's psychodrama enacted upon a passive Freedman. Freedman brought his own powerful investments to the encounter from the beginning — competitive anxiety, schizoid guardedness, emotional hunger, and a fierce independence that he himself explicitly identifies as a refusal to submit. The bilateral structure means that what appears in the record as Craig's "doing" to Freedman was often as much a *response* to Freedman as an imposition upon him. The double-bind was co-authored.

This does not diminish the intensity or clinical significance of Craig's investment. It deepens and complicates it: Craig was not simply acting out his pathology on a neutral screen. He was responding to a specific other whose own complexity activated, frustrated, and sustained Craig's investment across years.

II.2 Evidence of Intensity: A Systematic Survey

Evidence Cluster 1: The Asymmetry of Annoyance

A "guy in the office" who is merely tolerated does not generate the quality or duration of emotional response documented in the record. Craig's reaction to Freedman's *indifference* — specifically, his anger when Freedman ignored him — is the first and most powerful indicator of heightened investment. During their first week sharing office space, Craig made no social approach — consistent with his "Pope" posture — but when Freedman reciprocally made no approach, Craig exploded at week's end: *"It was really nice spending the week with you, Gary!"* (delivered sarcastically). The pattern reveals that Craig both refused to initiate contact *and* could not tolerate that Freedman would not initiate it either. This is the hallmark of an intensely ambivalent attachment, not indifference.

Evidence Cluster 2: The Enthusiastic "We Have So Much in Common" Speech (May 28, 1987)

Following months of mutual estrangement, when Freedman finally apologized for his coolness and suggested they had little in common, Craig launched into what the second document

describes as a "spirited reply" — enthusiastically enumerating shared interests, topic by topic, virtually insisting on the possibility of intellectual companionship. This moment of genuine, unguarded enthusiasm is the emotional counterweight to all the subsequent deflections and cruelties. The enthusiasm was real; the defenses that followed were reactions to the vulnerability that enthusiasm exposed. The abrupt reversal six weeks later — the "different lifestyles" speech — is the measure of how threatening that openness had been.

Evidence Cluster 3: The Party Invitation with Violent Hyperbole (September 1987)

"If you don't come to my party, I will burn down your house and kidnap your dog." This is not the language of indifference. Its very excess — the hyperbolic threat wrapped around a simple social invitation — reveals the degree to which Craig's desire for Freedman's presence had to be disguised, even to himself, as something other than desire. The violence of the joke is the measure of the warmth it conceals.

Evidence Cluster 4: The Harangue at the Christmas Party (December 18, 1987)

On December 18, 1987, Craig appeared at Freedman's office door and harangued him for approximately five minutes, insisting that Freedman attend the departmental Christmas party: *"Come to the party, Gar. Come to the party. Why don't you come to the party? Let's create some gossip!"* This behavior is entirely inconsistent with the posture of a man who regards another as merely one colleague among equals. The phrase *"Let's create some gossip"* is particularly revealing — it suggests Craig was aware, on some level, of the speculative freight their dyadic relationship carried in the workplace.

Evidence Cluster 5: The Proprietary Reaction to Freedman's Social Interactions with Others

When Freedman had dinner with Cindy Rodda in March 1988 — after Freedman had already left Hogan — and Cindy reported the pleasant evening to Craig, his response was: *"So he has a nice apartment. He probably spends all his time staring at his nice apartment because he doesn't have any friends."* Craig was not a party to this interaction; it was none of his concern. Yet he responded with contemptuous envy — as if, in Freedman's own observation, Craig had "a sense of ownership or entitlement to my friendly interactions with third parties — as if his idea was: 'If Gary is friendly with anyone, he should be friendly with me.'"

This proprietary jealousy is not the response of a man who regards another as simply "a guy in the office." It is the response of someone who experiences the other's independent social life as a narcissistic affront, as a deflection of resources that, in Craig's unconscious economy, belonged to him.

Evidence Cluster 6: The "Guilty Pleasure" Structure of Social Contact

Virtually every warm gesture Craig offered Freedman was preceded or followed by a sadistic act: the mattress prank before the friendly visit; the standing-up at Café Mozart before the Christmas invitation; the birthday visit culminating in the cruel "I just wanted to make your day"; the violent party invitation wrapping a genuine welcome. Freedman asks: *"Did CWD view his interacting with me as a guilty pleasure or an unconscious erotic pleasure, and that he needed to gratify a sadistic impulse in order to allow himself that guilty pleasure?"* In psychoanalytic terms, the sadism functions as a disavowal mechanism: by contaminating the warmth with cruelty, Craig can interact with Freedman while simultaneously denying the genuine libidinal valence of that interaction.

Evidence Cluster 7: The Double-Bind as Sustained Object Use

Craig's double-bind pattern — in which approach is sexualized and avoidance is experienced as attack — cannot be sustained toward an emotionally neutral object. Double-bind communication requires *investment*: the object must matter enough to be trapped, to be kept in a state of perpetual interpersonal wrong-footedness. The energy expenditure required to sustain this pattern over years — through the Hogan period and well into the post-employment phase — is incompatible with indifference. In Andrews's terms, citing Wisdom, the hysteric's double-bind is motivated by the need to maintain the other's "continued interest and attention." The very structure of the double-bind confirms that Freedman's presence, engagement, and responsiveness were valued — sought, even — while simultaneously threatening.

Evidence Cluster 8: The Post-Employment Persistence of the Dynamic

From early 1988, when Freedman left Hogan, through their last lunch in February 1992 and the final phone call in July 1993, the double-bind structure persisted — moderated in its sexualized and paranoid dimensions, but structurally unchanged. If Craig's reactions to Freedman had been primarily situational — driven by workplace dynamics or departmental politics — they should have attenuated rapidly once those situational factors disappeared. They did not. The underlying dynamic endured for over five years post-employment, evidence of what Kohutian self-psychology would recognize as an enduring **selfobject** configuration.

Evidence Cluster 9: Shared Aesthetic Life as Twinship Bond

The second document reveals a specific and substantive overlap in aesthetic sensibility: both men were moved by grand, politically charged, historically saturated art — Prokofiev, Eisenstein's *Ivan the Terrible*, the Abel Gance *Napoleon*, the Ring Cycle. The detail that Craig was listening to a Prokofiev piano concerto when Freedman visited his apartment before the party in 1987, and that years later Craig attended a Wolf Trap performance of the Prokofiev

score for *Ivan the Terrible* that both men loved, establishes the twinship dimension in concrete cultural terms. Craig's taste for "movies about dictators" (Napoleon, Ivan the Terrible) feeds into the phallic-narcissistic identification with power and conquest — but the sharing of this taste with Freedman was also, manifestly, a genuine point of connection.

Evidence Cluster 10: The Final Phone Call as Emotional Event

The July 14, 1993 telephone call is the most psychologically dense document in the record. Far from being the casual dismissal of an irritant, it is saturated with disguised emotional content. Craig's opening *"Why are you calling me after all this time?"* reverberates with the double meaning of abandonment. His insistence that it is "time to push me out of the nest," his oblique references to departed Hogan personnel (as if to evoke nostalgia and loss), his disclosure that he might "give this all up and move out west," and — most strikingly — his closing injunction to Freedman to "be friendly with dead people": none of these constitute the vocabulary of a man for whom the other was merely a passing annoyance. The second document frames this call with a Sartre epigraph from *No Exit* (*"Sorry! I fear I'm not good company among the dead"*) and the explicit parallel to the Camus-Sartre friendship, which ended with Sartre's later admission: "He was probably my last good friend." Freedman's own parallel statement — *"I lost my last good friend at age thirty-nine"* — establishes the magnitude of the loss from his side.

II.3 The Nature of the Investment: Object-Relations and Self-Psychology Analysis

A. Freedman as Narcissistic Mirror and Rival

In Kohutian self-psychology, a mirror selfobject reflects back to the self its grandiosity and uniqueness. Freedman's extraordinary intellectual gifts — his 136 IQ, his near-perfect scores on various cognitive assessments, his literary and analytical abilities — made him both a potential ideal mirror and a devastating threat to Craig's narcissistic economy. Freedman was Craig's intellectual equal or superior at a time when Craig was already suffering the narcissistic injury of underemployment. A true mirror reflects admiringly; Freedman's composure and independence instead confronted Craig with the possibility of a peer who needed nothing from him — which was intolerable. At the same time, Freedman's calm, non-submissive demeanor — *"I am shy and desperate for a friend, but I'm not submissive. I don't submit or surrender to anyone, no matter how much I like the person"* — was both maddening and compelling to Craig, who "fancied people who fawned over him." Freedman's refusal to submit made him psychically unreplaceable.

B. Freedman as Disruptive Selfobject

Craig's relationship to Freedman is best described in Kohutian terms as that of a **disruptive selfobject**: an other whose presence alternately shored up and threatened narcissistic self-cohesion. When Freedman initiated social contact, Craig's self-esteem was implicitly validated. When Freedman was indifferent or independent, Craig's fragile narcissistic equilibrium was destabilized, triggering characteristic rage and retaliatory cruelty.

C. Freedman as Transference Object: The Oedipal Drama

Freedman's hypothesis that he represented a quasi-parental, intellectualized authority figure in Craig's transference economy is supported by multiple behavioral indicators. The pattern of Craig's behavior — oscillating between a paranoid reading of Freedman as threatening authority and a sexualized reading of Freedman as a feminizing aggressor — maps onto the Oedipal drama as described by Reich: the phallic-narcissistic character's core conflict involves the warding off of passive-feminine impulses that threaten his masculine identity, with the figure who evokes those impulses cast alternately as seducer and punisher.

The specific regression to a **hysterical interpersonal posture** in relation to Freedman is explained by this transference: Freedman activated Craig's conflicts with the strict, demanding mother whose expectations imposed a feminizing demand on him. To comply with that figure's demands was to submit; to refuse was to be punished. Craig enacted this dilemma with Freedman as the screen onto which the terrifying parental imago was projected.

D. Freedman as Alter Ego: The Twinship Dimension

There is also a twinship dimension. Craig's spirited insistence in May 1987 that he and Freedman had "so much to talk about" — his enthusiastic cataloguing of shared interests — reveals a yearning for intellectual companionship and recognition. Craig was, beneath his arrogance, a culturally sophisticated, intellectually hungry man trapped in a menial position. Freedman represented what Craig might have been, or might yet aspire to: a man who had actualized his intellectual identity through law school, through sustained literary and analytical engagement, through the very seriousness of purpose that Craig's narcissistic defenses prevented him from sustaining. The contempt — *"he probably just sits at home staring at the four walls"* — may therefore contain, as its obverse, a form of identification: Craig knew what it was to sit alone, staring at fish.

II.4 The Last Lunch (February 1992): The Paternal Gesture

Freedman's account of the final in-person meeting is among the most poignant passages in the record: *"In a fatherly way, I said, 'I'm proud of you, CWD.' In a poignant gesture, he patted me on the back."* This moment — the pat on the back, the physical gesture of acknowledgment —

speaks directly past all of Craig's defenses. It is the only moment in the entire documented history in which Craig responds to genuine warmth with an *uncontaminated* gesture of return warmth. That it occurs at what is, unknown to either of them, their final meeting, gives it the character of a valediction — the moment when the theater briefly drops and something authentic surfaces.

II.5 The Sartre-Camus Parallel: A Valediction

The second document explicitly invokes the Camus-Sartre analogy. The two philosophers had a falling-out in 1952 from which they never recovered; they never spoke again; Sartre later said Camus "was probably my last good friend." Freedman states: *"I lost my last good friend at age thirty-nine."* The parallel is not merely literary decoration. It captures something structurally true about the Craig-Gary dynamic: two men of significant intellectual gifts and incompatible psychic economies who were, for a period, each other's most significant interlocutor — and whose friendship ended not through indifference but through the very intensity of what it stirred in both of them.

II.6 Revised Conclusion: The Intensity, Nature, and Depth of Craig's Investment

Craig Dye did not view Gary Freedman as merely "a guy in the office" equivalent to other coworkers. He was far more than that, and the record across both documents makes this unmistakable.

The nature of his investment was **psychodynamically intense, libidinal in the broad psychoanalytic sense, largely unconscious, and ego-dystonic** — meaning that it was threatening to his self-concept and therefore had to be distorted, denied, and expressed through aggression rather than acknowledged as what it was. The investment operated simultaneously on several registers:

- **Narcissistic register**: Freedman was a source of selfobject supply and a rival whose intellectual parity destabilized Craig's grandiose equilibrium.

- **Oedipal-transferential register**: Freedman activated Craig's unresolved conflict with a demanding parental imago, triggering the regressive hysterical posture and the double-bind.

- **Twinship register**: Freedman represented the intellectual companionship Craig craved but could not admit craving without relinquishing the grandiose front — and their shared aesthetic life (Prokofiev, Eisenstein, Wagner, Napoleon) gave this twinship a specific cultural body.

- **Libidinal register**: The documentation of sexualized responses to Freedman's approaches reflects displaced homoerotic anxiety that Craig's phallic-narcissistic structure required to be met with disgust, contempt, or humor rather than acknowledgment.

The intensity is measured not by warmth — for there was little of that, and what existed was invariably contaminated by cruelty — but by the energy, persistence, structural complexity, and duration of the relational drama Craig sustained in relation to Freedman across seven or more years. In clinical terms: neutral objects do not generate transference of this density. Casual colleagues do not trigger regressive hysterical postures. Men of no psychological significance are not told, at the moment of termination, to "be friendly with dead people."

Craig's emotional investment in Freedman is not coincidental to his personality structure — it flows directly from it. Freedman satisfied with unusual precision every requirement of Craig's narcissistic and transferential economy: he was the mirror that distorted, the rival who could not be vanquished, the transference object who would not submit, the twinship companion who would not capitulate. He was the one person in Craig's documented social world who generated anything like the sustained, charged, and complex engagement Craig sustained with him across the better part of a decade.

The revised picture, incorporating both documents, adds one crucial dimension: this was not a one-sided drama. Freedman, too, invested with unusual depth — competitive anxiety from the very first day, persistent social initiation across years, emotional generosity repeatedly offered and repeatedly contaminated, and finally the naming of the loss: *"I lost my last good friend at age thirty-nine."* The relationship was, in the fullest clinical sense, a **mutual transference** — each man activating in the other the deepest unresolved conflicts of his psychic life, each unable to fully inhabit or fully relinquish the bond, until the accumulated weight of its contradictions made continuation impossible.

The final word — Craig's instruction to *"be friendly with dead people"* — is his unconscious acknowledgment of what the relationship was: not the indifferent dismissal of a peripheral figure, but the cruel, defensive, and psychologically resonant rejection of the one person who had, more than anyone in his adult social world, gotten under his skin and stayed there.